REMARKS

Claims 8-22 are pending the application; all claims stand rejected. By this Amendment, Claims 8, 11-16 and 18-22 have been amended and Claim 20 cancelled. These amendments add no new matter to the application.

Applicant acknowledges the opportunity for a telephone Interview with the Examiner on August 24, 2004. During the Interview, claims 8 and 11 were discussed as to the cited references Dekelbaum and Needham. No agreement on allowable subject matter was reached. Applicant believes it was the Examiner's position that the cited art meets the limitations of claims 8 and 11, such as 'driving one or more client browsers to a web location without user interventions', but Applicant argued to the contrary. The Examiner declined to withdraw the finality of the action, and declined to consider entering any amendments to the claims after final.

Claims 8-12, 14-15, 17 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 as allegedly indefinite; Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Nevertheless, amendments made herein are believed to render moot these concerns, as antecedents for 'browser' and 'first user browser' are now all made more clear.

Claims 8-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 over Dekelbaum in view of Needham. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Applicant notes that while claims 8-19 are listed as rejected, no discussion of claim 11 is included with particularity in the final action by the Examiner. When asked during the 8/24 Interview, the Examiner indicated he intended that claim 11 be listed along in the discussion of claims 8-10. However, nowhere in the final action is there any discussion of the limitations that are particular to claim 11 (nevertheless, claim 11 and its further distinctions are discussed in detail below). Claims 9 and 10, implicitly incorporate all

6

the limitations of Claim 8, and therefore are also distinguished over the cited references, as further

discussed below.

Claim 8

Amended Claim 8 now reads:

8.   An internet communications system comprising a first user and a second user, a first user web chat module and a first user browser, and a second user web chat module, the second web chat module further comprising a browser driving module; wherein the first user web chat module is integrated with the first user browser to form an integrated combination, and the combination is connectable over the internet with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module for selectable control of the first user browser by the second user chat module's browser driving module such that the first user browser can thereby be driven to a location on the web selectable by the second user, without operational intervention by the first user.

In particular, amended claim 8 now requires, *inter alia*, the following limitations:

a.   a first user web chat module integrated with a first user browser to form an integrated combination;

b.   a second web chat module further comprising a browser driving module;

c.   the combination connectable over the internet with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module;

d.   for selectable control of the first user browser by the second user chat module's browser driving module;

e.   such that the first user browser can thereby be driven to a location on the web selectable by the second user without operational intervention by the first user.

None of these limitations are met in Dekelbaum or Needham or any combination of the

cited art. The Dekelbaum technology is concerned primarily with "... supply[ing] information to

a designated remote client on a data network in response to communications with the remote client

on a communications network separate and distinct form the data network. [emphasis added]"

Dekelbaum 5/22-25, and nowhere discusses a user having a web chat with another user and, from

inside that chat session, driving or leading that other user to some selected location on the web.

7

Taking the above limitations of amended Claim 8 in order,

a.   **a first user web chat module integrated with a first user browser to form an integrated combination;**

The Examiner cited Dekelbaum col 9, lines 10-50 and col 12, lines 1-21 to support his assertion that Dekelbaum "discloses an Internet communication environment for providing collaborative web browsing and chat functions", and in particular "one or more first user chat modules and first user browsers for enabling one or more users to simultaneously chat and browse the Internet over voice and/or data networks." But these cited lines are entirely concerned with voice chatting over telephone lines (not web chat), wherein the user voice chat is not (indeed, cannot be) in any way integrated with the user browser. Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest "a first user web chat module integrated with a first user browser to form an integrated combination".

b.   **a second web chat module further comprising a browser driving module;**

The Examiner cited Dekelbaum col 15, lines 18-25 to support his assertion that Dekelbaum discloses "a second agent chat module comprising a browser driving module". But in these cited lines, Dekelbaum actually discusses that a user first tells the sales representative the session ID that has been returned to the user after a sales rep initiated query; then the rep interrogates the data base of his Internet server and brings up on his screen a window that contains a copy of the Home Page the user is viewing; then the rep directs his Internet server to "push" a different Home Page to the user. Dekelbaum 15/17-25. First of all Dekelbaum's rep is not using a web chat module; secondly no part of whatever voice chat the rep is using includes any means to affect the user's browser.

8

First, the Dekelbaum rep can only change the users browser page by first generating a query to find out what session ID the user is assigned, having the user <u>read</u> that ID to him over the phone, and finally having the rep's server do a page push of the desired page to the user based on the reported session ID. There is no Dekelbaum module for causing a browser change - the procedure taught by Dekelbaum is an operational procedure (requiring moreover the user's active operational intervention, by the way - see further discussion of this point below) executed manually by the rep, not by any module.

Secondly, Dekelbaum himself clearly distinguishes browser page "pushing" from what might otherwise be browser "driving" or "leading" at col 15 lines 9-12, where he points out the difference between the server downloading a page "under local control (i.e. server 'push' of the data)" rather than the page download being "responsive to a client request (i.e. client 'pull'.)" In this way, Dekelbaum actually teaches away from browser driving, by denigrating "client pull" and emphasizing "server push". It is this 'client pull', not the server push, that is believed to be operating in the claimed invention, where the claimed second user's browser driving module inside his web chat module actually functions to send a page address to the first user browser <u>through</u> the first user's web chat module, so that the first user's own browser executes a page request or "client pull". Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest "a second web chat module further comprising a browser driving module".

     c.   **the combination [of first user web chat and first user browser] connectable over the internet with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module;**

Dekelbaum fails to teach or suggest any combination of first user web chat and first user browser that is connectable over the internet to anything; Dekelbaum teaches separate chat over voice lines,

9

and separate browser over the internet. Dekelbaum fails to teach or suggest any combination of chat and browser that is connectable with a second user web chat module, since in Dekelbaum the second user is not using a web chat module. Even if the Dekelbaum voice chat module were a substitute for the claimed web chat module, which Applicant disputes, such a voice chat module does not and cannot contain a browser driving module, as claimed. Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest "the combination [of first user web chat and first user browser] connectable over the internet with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module".

> d.   **for selectable control of the first user browser by the second user chat module's browser driving module;**

The Examiner also cited Dekelbaum col 15, lines 18-25 to support his assertion that Dekelbaum discloses "enabling a sale agent person to drive the first user browser to a location on the web selectable by the agent". But in these cited lines, Dekelbaum again only talks about the rep's manual page switching operational procedure, as discussed above; there is no browser driving module disclosed, and certainly not one that is part of the reps own web chat module. Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest "for selectable control of the first user browser by the second user chat module's browser driving module".

> e.   **such that the first user browser can thereby be driven to a location on the web selectable by the second user without operational intervention by the first user.**

The Examiner also cited Dekelbaum col 15, lines 18-25 to support his assertion that Dekelbaum discloses "enabling a sale agent person to drive the first user browser to a location on the web selectable by the agent without operational intervention by the first user". But in these cited lines, Dekelbaum not only does not teach page switching without operational intervention by the first user, he actually teaches away from this limitation by exclusively disclosing a manual page pushing

10

procedure that <u>explicitly</u> requires the operational intervention of the first user, namely the voice report of the returned session ID by the first user to the agent so the agent can set up the page push from his server. Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest a system where "the first user browser can thereby be driven to a location on the web selectable by the second user without operational intervention by the first user".

The Examiner also says Dekelbaum's collaborative web browsing is not limited to telephone ordering, but can be applied to other known types of online ordering. Dekelbaum col 16, lines 16-22. Applicant submits that Dekelbaum actually says in these lines that "while the preferred embodiment has been illustrated in terms of a telephone ordering system, it is understood to be equally applicable to other environments such as providing individual help during web research sessions, establishing dedicated conference bridges augmenting corresponding web activities, etc." Applicant submits that this is not a broad suggestion or teaching to employ a chat technology other than voice chat technology, but rather a suggestion only that this voice chat and manual browser page pushing process can be applied to the variety of environments stated (namely, providing individual help during web research sessions, establishing dedicated conference bridges and augmenting corresponding web activities). It is to be noted that among the alternative uses for Dekelbaum's disclosed system is NOT listed web chat controlled browser leading, such as is claimed by Applicant.

Since Dekelbaum fails to teach or suggest any of the above discussed limitations of amended Claim 8, or at least fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of the above discussed limitations, Claim 8 is distinguished over Dekelbaum and is now in condition for allowance; reconsideration and early favorable action on Claim 8 are therefore requested.

11

The Examiner now acknowledges that Dekelbaum does not disclose using a web chat module for either user; thus Dekelbaum is no longer a 102 reference. Instead, the Examiner cites Needham col 1, lines 28-34 as representative of what the Examiner says is well known in the art, namely, the use of an internet based chat module. Applicant submits that even assuming that use of an internet chat module *per se* was well known as of the earliest priority date of the claimed subject matter, Needham does not rise to the level of teaching any particular use of such a chat module other than using it to chat with ("The chat feature allows two or more people to converse by sending text messages back and forth" Needham col 1, lines 29-31); Applicant submits that all that is thus well known about an internet chat module is to have chats with other users. It is not well known, indeed not known at all (and no reference is cited for such a teaching), that an internet chat module might be integrated with a browser and then have that integrated browser remotely controlled by another user's web chat module, such as is presently claimed.

Needham is really just about transmitting real time, uninterrupted audio utterances over the internet, and contains no suggestion that it might advantageously be combined with any other usage, certainly not a browser controlling usage; there is therefore no motivation to combine Needham with Dekelbaum, and even if they are combined, they do not in their combination disclose the combination of limitations in amended Claim 8. Even if, as the Examiner suggests, Needham were combined with Dekelbaum simply to enable users "to avoid higher cost of communications over circuit-switched networks, i.e. long distance" the combination of Needham with Dekelbaum still do not disclose the combination of limitations in amended Claim 8, namely

a. a first user web chat module integrated with a first user browser to form an integrated combination;
b. a second web chat module further comprising a browser driving module;

12

c.   the combination connectable over the internet with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module;

d.   for selectable control of the first user browser by the second user chat module's browser driving module;

e.   such that the first user browser can thereby be driven to a location on the web selectable by the second user without operational intervention by the first user.

Claim 8 and its dependents are therefore also distinguished over the combination of Dekelbaum and Needham, and are now believed to be in condition for allowance; reconsideration and early favorable action are therefore requested.

Claim 11

Amended Claim 11 now reads:

11.   The system of claim 8 further comprising a plurality of users, third and successive users each having a user web chat module and a user browser in an integrated combination like that of the first user, the integrated combination for the first, third and successive users connectable over the internet with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module for selectable simultaneous control of the first, third and successive user browsers by the second user chat module's browser driving module such that all other user browsers can simultaneously be driven to a same location on the web selectable by the second user, without operational intervention by any of the other users.

In addition to the limitations contained in Claim 8 from which it depends, and which, as discussed above are nowhere met in the cited references, Claim 11 now also requires , *inter alia*, the following particular further limitations:

a.   The system of claim 8 further comprising a plurality of users, third and successive users each having a user web chat module and a user browser in an integrated combination like that of the first user;

b.   the integrated combination for the first, third and successive users connectable over the internet;

c.   connectable with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module for selectable simultaneous control of the first, third and successive user browsers by the second user chat module's browser driving module;

13

d.   such that all other user browsers can simultaneously be driven to a same location on the web selectable by the second user;

e.   without operational intervention by any of the other users.

None of these limitations are met in Dekelbaum or Needham or any combination of the cited art. Dekelbaum makes no provision, and teaches away from a plurality of users having web chat with each other <u>and</u>, from inside the chat session of a particular user, driving or leading all the other users simultaneously to a same selected location on the web.

Taking the above limitations of amended Claim 11 in order,

a.   **The system of claim 8 further comprising a plurality of users, third and successive users each having a user web chat module and a user browser in an integrated combination like that of the first user;**

As noted above for Claim 8, Dekelbaum's rep is not using a web chat module; and again, no part of whatever voice chat the rep is using includes any means to affect the user's browser. The Dekelbaum rep can only change the users browser page by first generating a query to find out what session ID the user is assigned, having the user <u>read</u> that ID to him over the phone, and finally having the rep's server do a page push of the desired page to the user based on the reported session ID. There is not, and cannot be, an integration of chat and browser, as claimed. Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest a "plurality of users, third and successive users each having a user web chat module and a user browser in an integrated combination like that of the first user".

b.   **the integrated combination for the first, third and successive users connectable over the internet;**

Dekelbaum does not teach or suggest integrated combinations of web chat modules and browsers for first, third and successive users that are all connectable over the internet with a second user.

14

c.   **connectable with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module for selectable simultaneous control of the first, third and successive user browsers by the second user chat module's browser driving module;**

Dekelbaum also does not teach or suggest these integrated combinations of web chat modules and browsers for first, third and successive users that are all connectable by a second user's web chat module for selectable simultaneous control of all the other user browsers.

During the 8/24 interview, the Examiner opined that Dekelbaum could have contemplated a phone conference with a plurality of users, somehow acquiring and capturing spoken-back session IDs for all users, and then simultaneously pushing the same page to all users in what he referred to as a conventional multi-cast. However, and particularly because of the nature of Dekelbaum's manual and linear process, it would be impossible for anyone using Dekelbaum's technology to achieve anything like simultaneity of control for all connected users. The Dekelbaum second user or rep would have to receive all session IDs orally from all other users simultaneously (even in a phone conference no rep could hear and record simultaneously all of the plurality of spoken session IDs, even assuming the rep could somehow induce all the users to speak simultaneously), or at least have to enter all the IDs simultaneously to his server (again, not possible, even supposing some kind of multi-cast technology in place), in order for his server to 'push' the desired page simultaneously to all users, and that is not only <u>not</u> disclosed by Dekelbaum, it is taught away from by his explicit discussion about two users and two users only, and applying his get-the-ID, then instruct-his-server manual process to push the page. Also, Dekelbaum in fact does not teach or suggest anywhere the desirability of dealing with more than one user at a time, and does not therefore teach or discuss phone conferences or multi-casting, all of which it is respectfully submitted could only be speculation on the Examiner's part.

15

Finally, it is NOT Dekelbaum's chat module that controls the browsers of the other users, as is claimed, but rather his own manual relationship to his server that controls the browsers of the other users. Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest "connectable with the second user web chat module and its browser driving module for selectable simultaneous control of the first, third and successive user browsers by the second user chat module's browser driving module".

    d.   **such that all other user browsers can simultaneously be driven to a same location on the web selectable by the second user;**

As discussed just above, nature of Dekelbaum's manual and linear process, make it impossible for anyone using Dekelbaum's technology to achieve anything like simultaneity of control for all connected users. Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest "such that all other user browsers can simultaneously be driven to a same location on the web selectable by the second user".

    e.   **without operational intervention by any of the other users.**

As discussed above for Claim 8, Dekelbaum not only does not teach page switching without operational intervention by the first user, he actually teaches away from this limitation by exclusively disclosing a manual page pushing procedure that explicitly requires the operational intervention of the first user, namely the voice report from the user of the returned session ID to the agent so the agent can set up the page push from his server. Dekelbaum thus fails to teach or suggest "without operational intervention by any of the other users".

Since Dekelbaum fails to teach or suggest any of the above discussed limitations of amended Claim 11, or at least fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of the above discussed limitations, and the combination of Needham with Dekelbaum also does not disclose the combination of limitations in amended Claim 11, Claim 11 is distinguished over Dekelbaum and

16

is now in condition for allowance; reconsideration and early favorable action on Claim 11 are therefore requested.

Claims 12 and 21-22

In addition to the limitations contained in Claims 8-9 from which they depends, and which, as discussed above are nowhere met in the cited references, Claims 12 and 21-22 now also require, *inter alia*, that a customer web chat module be downloaded to the customer as the customer is connected to the agent, or sent to the queue, respectively. Claim 12 further requires that the agent controls the customer browser <u>through</u> that web chat module downloaded to the customer.

No combination of cited references, including Anupam, disclose such a downloaded web chat module, and in particular fail to disclose control by the agent of the customer's web browser by means of that web chat module downloaded to the customer. Anupam at best discloses downloading to the customer a Java applet, referred to by Anupam as "surrogate 153" which Anupam expressly says is "created within [the customer's] browser". Anupam col 3, lines 4-5. Anupam also expressly says surrogate 153 "runs within [the customer's] browser". Anupam col 3, line 10. Thus the only applet downloaded by Anupam to a customer is this browser control surrogate, not a web chat module, as claimed. Anupam thus teaches away from Claims 12 and 21-22, and for Claim 12, the agent's control of the customer browser comes from being connected to the surrogate, not to a web chat module that is itself set up to control the customer's browser, as claimed. Applicant notes in passing that in arguing on the merits against the citation of Anupam in this case, that Applicant does not hereby waive its right to swear behind Anupam for the indicated claims, as it has already done for the other claims in the case, but declines to do so at present, believing its substantive distinctions are sufficient in these claims to overcome the

17

reference. Claims 12 and 21-22 are therefore distinguished over the cited art, and are believed to

be in condition for allowance; reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

Claim 13

Amended Independent Claim 13 now reads:

13.   A communications process comprised of the following steps:
1.   the customer clicks on a special hyperlink button on a website
accessible to the customer's browser;
2.   the customer is connected to the agent over the internet via the
hyperlink, and a customer web chat module is downloaded to the customer
for a real-time web chat with the agent;
3.   the agent controls the customer browser through the customer web
chat module to drive the customer browser to a location on the web selected
by the agent.

In particular, amended claim 13 now requires, *inter alia*, (a) that a customer click on a

hyperlink button to connect via the hyperlink, and (b) that a customer web chat module be

downloaded to the customer as the customer is connected to the agent, and (c) that the agent

controls the customer browser through that web chat module downloaded to the customer.

No combination of cited references, including Anupam, disclose such a downloaded web

chat module, and in particular fail to disclose control by the agent of the customer's web browser

by means of that web chat module downloaded to the customer. Anupam, as discussed in greater

detail just above, only discloses downloading to the customer a Java applet, referred to by Anupam

as "surrogate 153". Thus the only applet downloaded by Anupam to a customer is this browser

control surrogate, not a web chat module, as claimed. Anupam thus teaches away from Claim 13,

as the agent's control of the customer browser in Anupam comes from being connected to the

surrogate, not from being connected to a customer web chat module that is itself set up to control

the customer's browser, as claimed.

18

No combination of references discloses connecting to an agent by clicking a hyperlink. Dekelbaum only discloses clicking an autodialer button which creates a telephone call, not a web connection with the agent. Claim 13 is therefore distinguished over the cited art, and is believed to be in condition for allowance; reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

Claims 14-18

In addition to the limitations contained in Claims 8-9 and 13 from which they respectively depend, and which, as discussed above are nowhere met in the cited references, Claims 14-18 now also require, *inter alia*, that the respective users be joined in a virtual channel for web chat with each other (claims 14-16), and that all usage by customer and agent (which would include chat usage of course) be recorded on the server (claims 17-18).

No combination of cited references discloses such web chat in a virtual channel, and no combination of cited references discloses such recording on a server. Dekelbaum only discloses voice chat which cannot be combined in a virtual channel, and which cannot be recorded by the server. Claims 14-18 are therefore distinguished over the cited art, and are believed to be in condition for allowance; reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

Claim 19

In addition to the limitations contained in Claim 13 from which it depends, and which, as discussed above are nowhere met in the cited references, Claim 19 now also requires, *inter alia*, that the customer be placed in a virtual queue while the server notifies the agent that the customer has made a request for a web chat. The Examiner says that Dekelbaum discloses at col 14, lines 43-48 means for notifying or locating and agent, and be that as it may, Dekelbaum does not teach or suggest placing the customer in a virtual queue and telling the agent that the customer wants a

19

web chat, for Dekelbaum teaches nothing at all about web chatting. Claim 19 is therefore distinguished over the cited art, and is believed to be in condition for allowance; reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

Applicant believes that it has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed by the Examiner in the preceding Final Action, and respectfully requests reconsideration of all rejected claims and early favorable action on them as well.

<div align="right">Respectfully submitted,</div>

P01-RCB3.AMD

PATRICK MICHAEL DWYER
Reg. No. 32,411

PATRICK M. DWYER PC
1818 WESTLAKE AVENUE N, SUITE 114
SEATTLE, WA 98109